

ERPP Policy Issues
(Volume I)

- ✓ 1. pg 14 How are we going to protect diversion "hard points" in the stream meander vision?
- ✓ 2. pg 40 ERPP calls for incorporating "simulated flood peaks" in reservoir operations. We need to decide how to be more specific about criteria for this.
- ✓ 3. pg 63 "CALFED should map the hydrology and condition of all remaining riverine...flood plains." Should we take on this task?
- ✓ 4. pg 293 Should CALFED have a wildfire management program?
- ✓ 5. pg 295 Should CALFED pursue an invasive riparian and salt marsh plant program?
- ✓ 6. pg 315 Same issue for aquatic plants.
- ✓ 7. pg 312 Should CALFED pursue reduction of bullfrog and red-eared sliders?
- ✓ 8. pg 307 Should CALFED pursue control of harmful non-native wildlife?
- ✓ 9. pg 342 Should CALFED propose "catch & release" for steel head?
- ✓ 10. pg 343 Does CALFED support the legal harvest of stripers?
- ✓ 11. pg ~~344~~ Does CALFED support the legal harvest of sturgeon?
- ✓ 12. pg 345 Does CALFED support developing more waterfowl hunting?
- ✓ 13. pg 345 Does CALFED support developing more upland game hunting?
- ✓ 14. pg 365 Does CALFED support seasonal, local boat closures to protect habitat?

ERPP Policy Issues

(Volume ~~II~~)

1

1. pg 3 Should we propose to restore island elevation for islands with organic soils?
2. pg 4 Do we want to improve educational and recreational opportunities?
3. pg 4 How do we deal with increased Reclamation District work due to habitat restoration funded by program?
4. pg 21 Can we propose to purchase 10% of Central and West Delta land?
5. pg 31 Should we support a Striped Bass hatchery?
6. pg 109 Should we do restoration in Napa River, Sonoma Creek, Petaluma River?
Actions pg 122-140?
7. pg 369 How do we work with MID, TID, Merced, etc., to increase tributary flows? More storage? Purchase?
8. pg 372 How do we work with RWQCB policies on San Joaquin water quality? Can we support this from the fisheries standpoint?
9. pg 373 How are we going to partner with local agencies to improve land management and livestock grazing practices along riparian zones?
10. pg 381 Are we going to endorse AFRP flows in Stanislaus and other tributaries? How do we provide water to meet requirements?
11. pg 386 Are we going to support pulse flows on all tributaries when natural inflow supports pulses? How long are pulses? Should they be tied to snow melt forecasts of length of runoff? Should it be provided through Eco storage and enviros choose whether to release in dry years?
12. pg 387 Should we state that all diversions on all tributaries must be screened or is there a feasibility test?
13. pg 391 How are we going to partner with local small diverters on tributaries to maintain fish screens?
14. pg 393 In all other eco zones, how do we partner with counties on gravel management plans?

15. pg 393 & 394 Is CALFED going to encourage or actively pursue forming watershed conservancies for all tributaries?
16. pg 406 Are we going to "remove any temporary diversion dams" on all tributaries in the East San Joaquin Basin? How do we enforce that?
17. pg 412 upper watershed -- are we going to "encourage continued sound range management"? Or are we going to be more proactive?
18. pg 177 & following. In Sacramento Valley, are we going to "reestablish 50-100 year flood plains"?
19. pg 193 & following. Where we call for streambed modifications, do we need to bring Corps and DWR Flood Management into partnership?
20. pg 195 Where we specify removing diversions, do we apply some feasibility test, willing seller test, or provide alternate diversion techniques?

SYaeger/CALFED
3/3/97

syaege\lists\policye.rpp